

## INTRODUCTION

Clarion Associates and Economics Research Associates (ERA) have been retained by the Sonoran Institute, in partnership with the Lincoln Land Institute, to provide technical assistance in planning and analysis related to preparation of the Houghton Area Master Plan (HAMP). As part of this effort, the Clarion/ERA team is conducting a number of tasks, including a comprehensive case study review to evaluate the best of urban edge development associated with master planned communities; a market and financial assessment of the HAMP market area including an infrastructure and services cost assessment and an estimate of the revenue stream; and assisting City staff with the development of implementation tools for the HAMP area.

Our current task, contained within this document, is a diagnosis of the HAMP policies and plans prepared by City staff, considering both broad-brush as well as specific areas for improvement. Where possible, specific examples from our ongoing case study research have been integrated to help illustrate key concepts. This analysis has been organized into three parts following this introduction:

**I. Major Themes for Improvement.** The first section of this document contains the “big issues” related to the HAMP Policies. In many cases, this section does not discuss suggested revisions to policies in detail, but rather provides the basis for more detailed recommendations contained in the second section.

**II. Detailed Review of the Policies.** The second section contains a review of the Policies from the point of view of effectiveness, clarity, and consistency. Since the big issues are discussed in the first section, we do not discuss these issues again.

**III. Review of Implementation Issues.** The third section contains a preliminary assessment of the plan in terms of implementation.

## I. MAJOR THEMES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Several major themes emerged from our review of the most recent draft of the Houghton Area Master Plan (HAMP) produced by city staff, our recent survey of master planned communities and planning processes throughout the desert southwest, and our experience developing comprehensive plans, development standards, and zoning codes for communities across the country. This section provides an overview of these major themes. These major themes and goals include:

- 1. Provide For a “Big Picture” Context and Objectives for the Plan and a Set of Core Values for the HAMP;*
- 2. Refine the Organization of the Policies Into a More Clear Structure;*
- 3. Build In More Flexibility on the Location, Design, and Density of Plan Elements;*
- 4. Provide More Clarity on the Relationship between the HAMP Policies and Private Sector Master Plans; and*

## **5. Strengthen and Clarify Links to the City's Regulations and Existing Policy Document.**

Each of these major themes is discussed below.

### **1. Provide For a "Big Picture" Context and Objectives for the Plan and a Set of Core Values for the HAMP.**

Although we understand that an introduction and overview of key objectives is intended to be added once the final plan is prepared, we feel the addition of this element in subsequent drafts of the HAMP would be very beneficial both during the planning process as well as once the plan is adopted and more detailed planning and development-related activities are underway. This will help ensure a common understanding of what the city is trying to achieve with the HAMP. Answers to the following questions should be provided in a narrative form as part of the introduction:

- ***What is the City trying to achieve with HAMP?*** The plan and policies should clearly articulate the city's goal of achieving a unified vision for the Houghton Area. This would provide a context for the reader and would likely help reinforce the city's position in undertaking this effort.
- ***How is the HAMP intended to be used?*** The document should clearly define how the document is intended to be used once it is adopted.
- ***What are the core values for the Houghton Area?*** The document should include a clear statement of the guiding principles and objectives for the HAMP area. Based on our review of prior work on HAMP, and findings from the community case studies, we believe that the core values could be based upon the following:
  - *Pedestrian-oriented development and design*, providing a framework for neighborhoods and centers that can potentially be transit-oriented;
  - *An integrated system of open space*, that provides for accessibility and connectivity within and outside the HAMP area;
  - *A long-term, phased approach to development*, in order to provide for increased efficiency of infrastructure and services for residents;
  - *A range of housing types* which also address both affordability and livability;
  - *A mixed-use development pattern* that integrates places for people to live, work, shop, and play within a cohesive system of neighborhoods and village and regional centers.

## 2. Refine the Organization of the Policies Into a More Clear Structure.

At the most broad level, a clear structure is lacking within each of the Elements (i.e., Land Use and Design, Natural Environment, etc...) contained in the HAMP to set up a framework for subsequent policies in each area. Each of the Elements should be revamped to include a clear statement of introduction and background, a clear intent or "vision" for specific subareas within each Element (i.e., The Desert Villages Model, Villages and Neighborhoods, etc...), a series of concise goals for each subarea, and a set of supporting policies to address locational, design, and other criteria to be met by future private sector plans for the HAMP. A more detailed discussion of the application and content of each of these follow:

- ***Introduction and Background***—Provides background on the relevance of the Desert Villages Model within the context of each HAMP element. For example, while the Land Use and Design Element begins with a discussion of the Desert Villages Model, there is no background that explains to the reader why the Desert Villages Model is relevant to the HAMP from a land use perspective.
- ***Vision***—Where a number of subareas are included as part of a particular element, such as Villages and Neighborhoods, or the various Centers contained within the Land Use and Design Element, a clear intent statement or "vision" of the desired role for each as part of the HAMP needs to be included. Clarifying the common and unique features of each will allow the goals and policies that follow to more readily reinforce the objectives set forth and allow the reader to more readily understand what the distinguishing characteristics of each are (i.e., a Village vs. a Neighborhood) and how they relate to or differ from one another.
- ***Goals***—Goal statements would be "popped out" with descriptive headers, such as *Goal: Mix of Housing Types*, to allow the reader to quickly scan the section for major themes to be addressed. A more detailed goal statement would follow. In addition, goals that currently address multiple themes would be broken out into multiple goals according to those themes.
- ***Policies***—Each goal statement would be followed by a set of related policies, categorized by common themes where appropriate. For example, all goals and policies specifically related to the Centers will be clustered together and broken out by common themes, such as Locational Criteria or Circulation and Connectivity. Where there are policies unique to a Desert Village Component, they can be addressed separately.

To help illustrate how a revised structure for the HAMP, as recommended above, would possibly be organized, a sample section is provided in the appendix of this document.

## 3. Build In More Flexibility on the Specifics of Individual Plan Elements.

One of the key lessons learned from the case studies was the need to provide clear direction at a broad policy level, but to allow room for flexibility within those parameters. The HAMP should be used to reinforce the goals of the City's General Plan and to establish a framework for the "basics" of the Desert Villages Model— an integrated open space system, pedestrian-oriented design, a mix

of uses and housing types, and a hierarchy of neighborhoods and centers. Within that framework, the HAMP should allow for flexibility and creativity on the part of the private sector in achieving these objectives.

Civano provides a good local example of why flexibility is so critical to the successful implementation of any master planned community, having struggled with slower than expected absorption rates and changes in ownership. Those with close ties to the project in both the public and private sectors point to several factors, including rigid lot layouts and strict architectural controls that limited the number of homebuilders involved, an inability to appeal to a family-oriented marketplace, and higher than anticipated costs to implement environmental conservation elements, among others. However, one of the largest issues in the initial Plan, according to some members of the local development community was the inclusion of required minimum densities at levels above what is typically found in the Tucson marketplace. While those interviewed agreed that a mix of housing types was desirable and was appropriate as a requirement, whether for Civano or for the HAMP—minimum densities were seen as a major hurdle for the success of future projects.

#### **4. Provide More Clarity on the Relationship between the HAMP Policies and Private Sector Master Plans.**

In today's marketplace, virtually all contemporary master-planned communities are guided by a detailed community plan and set of design guidelines and standards that are prepared by the master developer to guide the development of multiple phases over time. The HAMP should include clear direction on the process and expectations regarding how these community master plans and other documents are to meet the specific policy objectives contained in the HAMP, and how they will be achieved during the planning, design, and development stages. Approval of community master plans should be clearly linked to a process that establishes how the various elements of the plan meet the objectives outlined in the HAMP.

As an example, planned communities within the City of Las Vegas, such as Summerlin, must be included in the Planned Community District (P-C), which encourages the development of unique, comprehensively planned communities with a minimum of 3,000 contiguous acres under a single ownership or control. In order to qualify for P-C District zoning, the master developer must demonstrate how a series of specific objectives will be achieved during the planning, design, and development stages. Key objectives include provision of the following:

- A mix of housing types, employment opportunities, and commercial services to encourage a diverse population;
- A planned and integrated multi-modal transportation system;
- Adequate open space and community facilities;
- Cultural, educational, medical, religious, and recreational facilities; and
- View corridor and natural feature protection.

Approval of P-C District zoning is awarded in conjunction with the approval and adoption of a Planned Community Program that establishes the types and general relationships of land uses on the site, maximum per gross acre residential densities, open space quantity and location, and other factors necessary to meet the objectives outlined above.

## **5. Strengthen and Clarify Links to the City's Regulations and Existing Policy Document.**

An important aspect of the HAMP review is an initial assessment of the plan in terms of implementation. The project scope of work sets forth several key implementation questions that the diagnosis should address:

- Will the design guidelines and other plan policies achieve the stated goals?
- What obstacles to implementation success exist?
- What are the inconsistencies with existing City of Tucson development code and land use ordinances?

Our preliminary review of the HAMP policies has indicated a number of areas of concern. These include a lack of clarity about how the proposed design guidelines will be used, and inconsistencies between the HAMP policies and the existing City of Tucson Development Code and Land Use Ordinances. Probably the biggest challenge to implementation success is that existing city standards and regulations as contained in the Land Use Code, Development Standards, and Design Guidelines Manual either do not address some of the key goals contained in HAMP, or they are contrary to the proposed design guidelines.

Our review of these implementation issues is discussed at length in section III of this document.

An example of a community that has constructed a particularly clear (and thorough) set of regulations that guide all of its development is the City of Scottsdale. Scottsdale has gone to great lengths to protect the natural features attributed to its Sonoran Desert location and to ensure that future development is in keeping with the communities established character. It accomplishes this through the use of a comprehensive compilation of policies and guidelines related to the City's built environment, called the "Sensitive Design Program". The Program is based on several elements, including the Sensitive Design Principles and a set of Architectural Design Guidelines. While many of these policies or guidelines are not regulatory in nature, they are supported at all levels of the city's government and are consistently enforced by elected and appointed officials—creating a clear expectation of quality, regardless of the project.

## **II. REVIEW OF THE SPECIFIC POLICIES**

This section will address the strengths and the shortcomings of each of the sections of the draft Policies. Since the overall organization and structure has been addressed as a major theme above, we will avoid talking about organizational issues here.

### **Element 1: Land Use and Design**

*Note: A sample re-organization of this section is provided in the appendix of this document to better illustrate the organizational suggestions outlined as part of Major Theme #2: Refine the Organization of the Policies into a more Clear Structure. In some cases, suggested policy revisions have been completed to help clarify a particular point, in other cases, the need for additional discussion or policies is simply noted.*

**A: The Desert Villages Model**

In general, the goal and policies for the Desert Villages Model provide an overall view of what the City's objectives are for the HAMP; however, they are very general, and it might be helpful to further clarify some of the elements of the DV model as defined in the City's General Plan and why they should be applied within the HAMP (its large size, potential to be developed by multiple developers, etc...). Some concepts from the General Plan that could be reinforced include:

- Desert Village is a large-scale development made up of integrated master-planned communities;
- Should be based on a system of unified control during the phasing process to ensure long-term successful implementation;
- Should be planned and phased to efficiently extend infrastructure;
- Need to relate to and incorporate existing areas of development.

In addition, variations in terminology between the General Plan and the HAMP should also be clarified to avoid potential confusion. This comment applies primarily to the General Plan's use of the term *master planned communities* (MPCs) as the largest component of the DV model, where the HAMP seems to use the term *village* in its place.

**B: Villages and Neighborhoods**

- Many of the policies contained within this section would more appropriately be located under Section C, Town, Villages, and Neighborhood Centers, since they address criteria related to centers.
- May want to consider whether mandating minimum densities is the best approach, particularly for Village Centers and surrounding areas. It might be more appropriate to establish a mix requirement by land area (i.e., centers to include a mix of uses, with at least 20% of land area to include residential housing), as well as by type of housing (i.e., centers to include higher-density housing types, not to include single family dwellings – town homes, condominiums, or residential as part of a mixed-use building containing at least two different land uses). As mentioned under Major Themes, above, trying to regulate densities with a heavy-handed approach can be risky with greenfield properties such as the HAMP, as is evidenced through on-going challenges with the implementation of Civano.
- May want to consider the incorporation of policies that address the fact that the HAMP may be developed by multiple developers over an extended period of time, depending upon the release rate of State Land Office property, market limitations, and other factors. Appropriate policies would address the need for close coordination between project phases to ensure later phases of development are compatible with and integrated with early phases. Key concerns will be connections between existing and planned neighborhoods and villages and the relationship of new phases to existing ones in terms of scale, density, and uses. A case study example of how phasing policies can be supported for multiple Villages is evident at Otay Ranch, located in San Diego County. Recognizing that the community vision of Otay Ranch is most present in the village concept, Village Design Plan Requirements have been established. Village

Design Plans provide special design considerations for project implementation. Every Village is required to have a Village Design Plan, which must be consistent with the General Development Plan. Village Design Plans establish a unique identity and theme for each Village and incorporate its landscape and streetscape guidelines.

- Finally, it may be appropriate to strengthen policies that define connections between as well as within neighborhoods and villages.

### C. Town, Village, and Neighborhood Centers

- This section of the policies contains a number of related, but distinct topics, and should be better organized to ensure clarity of the policy objectives it contains. For example, policy C.1.d, related to Town Centers, contains at least 4 distinct concepts – Town Center orientation, connectivity, relationship between key elements and public spaces, and mix of uses within buildings.
- Several policy elements related to the location of Village Centers that should be more directly addressed include their location with respect to the area's roadway network (i.e., should they be located at the intersection of arterial roadways, or other desired location?); and their location and design relationship/connections to the regional open space system.
- Most importantly, the policies for the centers "chip away" at various aspects of how the city would like to see these places designed, but don't speak directly to their overall structure and desired form. A broad discussion regarding the form and structure of these places should be clearly distinguished as an intent or "vision" statement that sets the stage for the policies that follow. In support of the established vision, the policies should be clearer about the desired form and pattern. In some cases where characteristics overlap between the Centers, policies can be grouped under a general heading, where distinct variations exist, they will need to be addressed in a separate policy section for each of the three types of centers.

### D. Community Design

- This section should speak more broadly to the desire to establish an overall sense of community character at the neighborhood and village level. This should incorporate a number of elements, including:
  - Community Identity
  - Natural Open Space
  - Urban Landscape
  - Architectural Design
- Note that we are not suggesting that a particular design theme should be developed and applied to all development uniformly within the HAMP, but rather that each neighborhood and village should have a design structure that provides a unifying element. In some cases, cities such as Scottsdale have developed detailed design

guidelines to help clarify their expectations for new development and have used them as a tool for reviewing individual components of proposed master planned communities. Other communities, such as Buckeye, Arizona, have focused on a small number of key design characteristics to address as part of the city's Zoning Code, such as a "3 x 3" variety requirement for housing types (floor plans, colors, and facades) to ensure that minimum expectations are written in stone.

## **Element 2: Circulation and Transportation**

- This section should be carefully reviewed to determine if desired land use and design objectives are in alignment with some of the access management roadway standards contained in the policies. For example, the policies contain intersection spacing standards that are typical of suburban development patterns, whereas contemporary neighborhood street design policies typically call for small block sizes, narrow streets, and more frequent access to roadways to avoid the conventional arterial/collector-based system. If these policies/standards are required to provide for the regional network, then it might be appropriate to include a separate set of policies that relate to streets at the neighborhood scale.
- Many of the master planned communities reviewed negotiated street widths that were significantly narrower than existing city standards. In some cases, such as DC Ranch in Scottsdale, the resulting street network was successful. However; the City of Tucson has faced some challenges regarding "skinny streets" as part of Civano's Neighborhood I. Ongoing complaints and concerns with parking and accessibility have resulted in the incorporation of a revised street cross-section for Neighborhoods II and III. While this by no means implies that the City should avoid a more pedestrian-oriented pattern of streets, it does mean that future cross-sections should be cognizant of previous concerns.

## **Element 3: Natural Environment**

- It may be appropriate to retitle this section "Natural and Cultural Environment, and expand its scope to address additional topics, including archeological and cultural resources.
- It might be appropriate to expand the policies to address other environmental factors such as sustainable levels of water use, air quality, hazardous materials, etc. unless these are adequately addressed by citywide policies.

## **Element 4: Public Facilities**

### **A: Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails**

- The policies in this section provide very thorough direction with regard to improved park facilities, but do not address larger-scale open space issues. The policies should address linkages and relationships to the Saguaro National Park, as well as the plan's relationship and shared objectives and policies with the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. Several case study projects are also located adjacent to major public land



holdings. A lesson to be learned from these projects—Summerlin (Nevada), DC Ranch (Scottsdale), and Hidden Springs (Idaho) to name a few, is that the significance of adjacent public lands cannot be overemphasized. In terms of its role in defining community character and open space linkages, in marketing, in the long-term value of the land, and of the project's perception within the established community, this should be a major defining element of the HAMP.

**B: Schools**

- Consider strengthening the policies in this section with regard to location and pedestrian access to school sites, particularly from neighborhoods and centers. Neighborhood centers are particularly good locations for elementary schools.

**C: Tucson Fire Department**

- The policies define very specific locations for station sites, tied to future road alignments. It may be appropriate to define locational criteria that could be used to identify other sites with equally acceptable locations and features, in case the plan and roadway alignments should change over time.

**D: Tucson Police Department**

- No additional comments

**E: Libraries**

- Similar to C. above, consider strengthening the policies in this section with regard to location and pedestrian access to libraries, particularly from neighborhoods and centers. Neighborhood or village centers are also good locations for libraries.

**F: Public Administration Facilities**

- No additional comments

**G: City of Tucson General Services**

- No additional comments

**H: Public Environmental Services**

- No additional comments

**I: Public Communication Facilities**

- No additional comments

### **III. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

An important aspect of the HAMP review is an initial assessment of the plan in terms of implementation. The project scope of work sets forth several key implementation questions that the diagnosis should address:

- Will the design guidelines and other plan policies achieve the stated goals?

- What obstacles to implementation success exist?
- What are the inconsistencies with existing City of Tucson development code and land use ordinances?

This section addresses these key questions and presents a more detailed analysis of each of the key topics contained in the plan in terms of implementation through existing zoning provisions, development standards, and design guidelines.

### **Design Guidelines and Other Plan Policies**

The proposed design guidelines and plan policies in HAMP provide a good start in clarifying the goals upon which changes in existing design guidelines and zoning regulations can be based. The proposed design guidelines also are useful in identifying various specific issues-- such as open space preservation, mixed-use activity centers, and a mix of housing types throughout the plan area--that must be addressed if the HAMP is to become reality.

However, it is not clear how the proposed design guidelines will be used. Some are written as if they are intended to be regulations that would amend the existing City of Tucson Design Guidelines Manual, Land Use Code, and Development Standards. For example, the level of specificity in areas such as minimum densities and infrastructure design is highly unusual for a comprehensive plan. To illustrate, Element 1.B.2 sets forth exact minimum residential densities based on distance from a village center and specifies that sidewalks be 6 feet wide. These are typically details found in development codes and design standards. More general statements of intent may be sufficient to guide code revisions without getting bogged down into such detail at this point.

On the other hand, other proposed design guidelines are very vague. For example, the parking design guidelines (Element 2.G) request that parking lots "include attractive and substantial landscaping" and be designed to "minimize walking distances" to the uses they serve. More details are needed here to provide clearer guidance for implementation.

Finally, there appears to be a strong emphasis on design guidelines as the primary tool for implementation. While regulations often form the backbone of a plan implementation strategy, the plan should address other implementation tools such as land preservation (e.g., land dedications), incentives (e.g., density bonuses for exemplary open space conservation), and capital facility policies (such as targeting capital investments/infrastructure improvements to the town/village centers).

### **Potential Obstacles to Implementation**

Probably the biggest challenge to implementation success is that existing city standards and regulations as contained in the Land Use Code, Development Standards, and Design Guidelines Manual either do not address some of the key goals contained in HAMP, or they are contrary to the proposed design guidelines. For example, a number of the current design guidelines contained in the Design Guidelines Manual are very suburban-oriented (such as those calling for transition between adjacent uses) and will make achieving the compact, denser development form contemplated by HAMP very difficult. Others, such as existing City standards and guidelines

addressing site circulation actually contradict those set forth in HAMP (e.g., use of cul-de-sacs, sidewalk width, and parking lot layout).

Perhaps a more fundamental issue is the status and use of the existing Design Guidelines Manual and its relationship to adopted regulations. While the manual contains many useful design concepts, it is not clear exactly what weight it carries in practice. Apparently the design guidelines have not been formally adopted, but instead are used informally by staff in the project review process. To make matters more confusing, many of the guidelines are very vague and, according to staff and developers, difficult to interpret and understand. Moreover, a number are not supported by or actually contradict adopted regulations contained in the Development Standards and Land Use Code. In other instances, the design guidelines and Standards/Code address the same topics but in somewhat different language. When the proposed guidelines contained in HAMP are stirred into this mix, the whole implementation picture becomes very murky. These relationships need to be sorted out and the various sources of development and design standards organized into a more coherent approach. One fundamental decision to be considered is whether the approach to be taken in sorting out these standards is to apply city-wide, or packaged as a set of standards that would apply specifically to the HAMP area.

Another potential obstacle to implementation has to do with the receptivity of Tucson—elected officials, staff, and the development community—to more detailed and directive design standards as embodied in HAMP. While these types of development quality and environmental protection/open space standards are fairly commonplace in other Western jurisdictions, as witnessed by the case studies, they represent a fairly significant change from those now on the books in Tucson.

### **Inconsistencies with Existing City of Tucson Development Code and Land Use Ordinances**

While several existing provisions found in the City of Tucson Design Guidelines Manual, the Land Use Code, or Development Standards are consistent with and can readily play a role in implementing HAMP (e.g., the Environmental Resource Zone regulations can protect washes and open space), there are numerous inconsistencies and conflicts with these documents. The inconsistencies fall into three broad categories: (1) development concepts and standards/guidelines contained in HAMP that address issues not covered in any existing land use regulatory documents; (2) standards/guidelines in HAMP that overlap and are somewhat inconsistent with existing provisions; and (3) standards/guidelines that contradict existing regulations and guidelines.

In the first category are concepts such as mixed-use activity centers. None of the current zone districts is particularly suited to address or encourage the type of activity centers envisioned by HAMP. While the Land Use Code does contain several mixed-use districts, they do not deal with some key issues such as minimum densities, the preferred mix of uses, and important transitional/compatibility issues that modern mixed-use zone districts typically address. Similarly, existing provisions in the Land Use Code and Development Standards do not cover many of the design and environmental concepts that are a recurrent theme in HAMP (e.g., ground-floor retail, housing mix, detention basin design, restrictions on gated communities, to name a few).

In the second category fall issues such as pedestrian connectivity and safety design that are addressed by HAMP and in the code/standards/guidelines, but with varying degrees of depth and consistency. To illustrate, HAMP places a great deal of emphasis on an interconnected network of roads, bicycle, and pedestrian routes throughout the area and sets forth some detailed standards towards that end. The existing code/standards contain a number of sections on transportation networks, but with significantly less emphasis on pedestrian connections. Similarly, HAMP targets the issue of park accessibility, a subject that receives only minimal treatment in existing development standards.

Finally, there are several existing regulations and guidelines that appear to be at odds with HAMP policies and guidelines. For example, the street requirements contained in the Development Standards apparently require lane widths that are excessive for compact, mixed-use developments.

The attached table outlines in greater detail the key HAMP concepts and policies and compares them to existing standards and guidelines. Once the HAMP policies have been finalized, the consulting team will undertake a more detailed analysis of potential implementation tools and existing Land Use Code and Development Standards in light of HAMP goals and objectives.

## HOUGHTON AREA MASTER PLAN PRELIMINARY IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION

KEY TOPICS	PROPOSED HAMP POLICIES/INTENT	ZONING & DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS	DESIGN GUIDELINES MANUAL
<b>LAND USE/DESIGN</b>			
<i>Desert Village Model</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Villages around town center</li> <li>MU activity centers</li> <li>Housing variety</li> <li>Regional open space sys.</li> <li>Alternative transportation system</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural Village Center district doesn't address MU</li> <li>OCR is MU district, but doesn't address preferred mix, minimum densities, housing variety, transitions, etc.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban Village/MP Commercial is special design option, but short on detail, <b>standards</b></li> <li>MU transit Standards (p. 10)</li> </ol>
<i>Villages/Neighborhoods</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connected neighborhoods around VC; MU</li> <li>Variety of housing types</li> <li>Minimum densities</li> <li>Pedestrian/retail environment</li> <li>Streetscape variety</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General street development standards (Sec. 3); include pedestrian circulation regulations.</li> <li>Neighborhood commercial district allows MU.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design guidelines promote pedestrian connections (pp. 5, 23-25) and access to open space (p. 22)</li> </ol>
<i>Centers</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One town center; can organize around mall</li> <li>Minimum densities</li> <li>Pedestrian/retail environment</li> <li>Building design standards.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail trade group perform criteria (Sec. 3.5.9)</li> <li>C-3 Commercial ZD inadequate; ORC MU district may be vehicle for centers.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large retail design <b>standards</b></li> </ol>
<i>Community Design</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Range of standards to improve development quality (scenic, cell towers, Xeriscape)</li> <li>Safe design standards</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water conservation standards</li> <li>Scenic Corridor Zone (SCZ) provides standards.</li> <li>Planting for security regulations (p. 17)</li> </ol>	Design guidelines cover many quality aspects—often vague and suburban.
<b>CIRCULATION/TRANSPORTATION</b>			
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interconnected street/ pedestrian system—emphasize connections</li> <li>Parking design standards, but modest</li> <li>Circulation plan to accommodate future transit.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Art. 3.3 has parking regulations including MU, but little re design</li> <li>Sec. 3 Development <b>standards</b> has street <b>standards</b> and parking design, but mainly dimensional.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vehicle and pedestrian circulation guidelines address MU (p. 9) but very little on parking lot design.</li> </ol>

KEY TOPICS	PROPOSED HAMP POLICIES/INTENT	ZONING & DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS	DESIGN GUIDELINES MANUAL
<b>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</b>			
	1. Goal is to protect natural resources to "fullest extent feasible." 2. Protect native plants 3. protect/restore washes and drainages 4. Minimize grading	1. Native plant protection in Art. III.8 2. HDZ (119) and ERZ (156) provide protections for designated areas.	1. General statement re environmentally sensitive design. (p3)--vague 2. Sensitive lands cluster option (p. 45) 3. Grading to be minimized (p. 20)
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES</b>			
<i>Parks/OS/Trails</i>	1. Provide trails/parks in designated locations 2. Interconnected systems. 3. Multi-use with schools, etc.	1. General street development standards address pedestrian circulation	1. Includes section on pedestrian connections and alternative transportation modes
<i>Schools</i>	1. Joint use with library, parks 2. Locate near village center	NA	NA
<i>Fire/Police</i>	1. Specific locations specified. 2. Some locational criteria	NA	NA
<i>Libraries</i>	1. Co-location with schools	NA	NA
<i>Public Admin. Facilities</i>	1. Locate in TC or VC	NA	NA
<i>General Services</i>	1. Special locational criteria	NA	NA
<i>Environmental Services</i>	1. Special locational criteria	NA	NA

## APPENDIX: SAMPLE SECTION

### ELEMENT 1: LAND USE

#### COMMENTARY:

*Following is a sample of a revised section to help clarify our policy discussion in the attached Plan and Policy Review document and to help illustrate how a revised structure for the HAMP, as recommended, would possibly be organized. For the most part, existing discussion and policies within the HAMP have simply been re-organized, in some cases the additional language was added or existing language re-worded to clarify a particular intent.*

#### A. Introduction

*Add discussion of Land Use context for the HAMP—why the Desert Village Model?*

- Size
- Area may not be developed by single developer, therefore:
  - The Plan should provide for a coordinated pattern of development over extended time frame
  - The Plan should strive for consistency at the framework level (open space, connectivity, mix of uses)

#### B. The Desert Villages Model

As defined within the City of Tucson General Plan, the Desert Village is a large-scale development made up of integrated master planned communities (Villages) and Neighborhoods, integrated with a Desert Village Center. Land uses in the HAMP should be organized and developed according to the essential features of the Desert Villages Model, which includes:

- The incorporation of a broad mix of uses;
- The use of a Town Center as a central organizing feature;
- A hierarchy of mixed-use activity centers surrounded by a series of Villages.
- Mixed-use activity centers that include both residential and non-residential uses that serve different market scales, and that are located strategically throughout the HAMP area.
- A series of Villages, each of which includes a variety of housing types and densities;
- A transportation and circulation system that offers residents alternatives for mobility, giving high priority to public transportation and pedestrian and bicycle routes; and
- A regional open space system that preserves washes and environmentally sensitive areas.

### C. Villages and Neighborhoods

To reinforce the objectives of the Desert Village Model, uses will be organized into a series of Villages and Neighborhoods, focused around a series of mixed-use activity centers: the Town Center, Village Center, and Neighborhood Center, each of which is discussed in E., below. While Villages and Neighborhoods are similar in construct, their primary distinguishing features are described in greater detail below.

**Villages**—Villages are the larger of the two primarily residential components of the Desert Village hierarchy and will contain multiple freestanding, but integrated neighborhoods. Villages should be organized within the sphere of influence of the Town Center. The planning and community design of the Villages should result in a minimum overall residential density that can sustain regular transit usage as well as make the Desert Village Centers economically viable. Villages will be integrated through open space and recreation areas and pedestrian and bike facilities, with a transit-accommodating roadway system. Connectivity of the vehicular (transit and private automobile), pedestrian, and bicycle modes is to be provided to enhance the internal movement within and between the individual Neighborhoods that comprise the Village and to accommodate external trips within the region. Village boundaries are not delineated in the HAMP, but it is envisioned that a village may contain 8,000 to 12,000 people.

**Neighborhoods**—Neighborhoods, the smallest component of the Desert Village hierarchy, are intended to be part of the larger community, while also maintaining an individual identity and sense of place. *Need to add additional discussion on "vision" for neighborhoods.*

## 1. GOAL: FLEXIBLE FRAMEWORK OF VILLAGES AND NEIGHBORHOODS

Establish a flexible framework of Villages and Neighborhoods for the HAMP that will allow a coordinated pattern of development to occur over an extended period of time.

### a) GENERAL POLICIES FOR VILLAGES AND NEIGHBORHOODS

#### (1) Village and Neighborhood Definition

- (a) The location and size of Villages and Neighborhoods should be identified at the time of development.
- (b) Establish the optimal size of a Neighborhood to be one-quarter mile from center to edge.

#### (2) Circulation and Connectivity

- (a) Create an interconnected network of vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle routes to provide clear connections both within and between Villages, Neighborhoods, and Centers.
- (b) *Need to add additional policies regarding phasing...i.e., ensuring connections are planned for and provided, monitoring regional transit service and providing as feasible.*



## **2. GOAL: MIX OF HOUSING TYPES**

To provide a variety of housing opportunities within the HAMP for all types of families and individuals, offer convenient access to goods and services, and incorporate natural open space, recreation, public areas, and schools into the fabric of the community.

### **a) GENERAL HOUSING POLICIES FOR VILLAGES AND NEIGHBORHOODS**

#### **(1) Mix of Housing Types**

- (a) Incorporate a variety of housing types at the Village and Neighborhood scale, providing a range of densities and price ranges.
- (b) Housing types should include a mixture of apartments and lofts, townhomes, condominiums, patio homes, starter homes, family homes, luxury homes, and senior-oriented housing.
- (c) Affordable Housing (The affordable housing policy has not been finalized. It is still under internal City review.)

#### **(2) Locational Criteria**

- (a) Higher intensity housing types should generally be concentrated within and adjacent to Neighborhood and Village Centers, within close proximity to services and transportation options.
- (b) Low-density housing should be located on the periphery of the HAMP to serve provide a more gradual transition to adjacent public lands.

## **3. GOAL: MIX OF USES**

Villages and Neighborhoods should be designed to accommodate a balanced mix of activities, including housing, recreation, education, and neighborhood-scaled retail and service uses where feasible.

### **a) GENERAL POLICIES FOR VILLAGES AND NEIGHBORHOODS**

#### **(1) Mix of Uses**

- (a) Individual Villages and Neighborhoods should consist primarily of residential uses, combined with a mix of complementary employment, retail, commercial, recreational, and public uses, concentrated within Centers.

#### **(2) Locational Criteria**

- (a) Retail and commercial uses, along with public facilities such as schools, libraries, neighborhood parks, and other similar facilities should be concentrated within Village or Neighborhood Centers.
- (b) Industrial and other high intensity non-residential uses not compatible with the overall land use mix of the Villages and Neighborhoods should be located within the Davis Monthan Approach/Departure Corridor.
- (c) Locate outdoor activity areas such as parks, plazas, playgrounds, and other open space areas so that they are:
  - (i) highly visible;
  - (ii) accessible from a maximum number of homes and locations;
  - (iii) within or in close proximity to Centers, school sites and other public facilities; and

- (iv) linked to other open space areas within and outside the development.

#### 4. GOAL: NEIGHBORHOOD-ORIENTED DESIGN

Design Neighborhoods as part of the larger Village community, while maintaining an individual sense of place and identity.

##### a) GENERAL NEIGHBORHOOD POLICIES

##### (1) Neighborhood Character and Design

- (a) Provide a variety of housing types and models at both the neighborhood and block scales.
- (b) Provide a variety of lot sizes, building footprints, building orientation and setbacks, rooflines, and architectural features and colors;
- (c) Encourage the use of front porches, patios, and other outdoor gathering spaces.
- (d) Provide variety in the design and placement of garages and carports, including the use of side or rear access, shared driveways, or other such design elements so they do not dominate Neighborhood streetscapes.

#### D. Town, Village, and Neighborhood Centers

To reinforce the objectives of the Desert Village Model, mixed-use activity centers within the HAMP will be encouraged to occur in three distinct forms: a single Town Center, a series of Village Centers, and a series of Neighborhood Centers. While some common themes exist that span the three types of centers, each varies in terms of its size, location, primary and secondary uses, number, and market draw. Each is described in greater detail below.

***Town Center (TC)***—The Town Center will be the largest of the three centers and will serve as a primary focal point for the HAMP as well as for the surrounding community. The Town Center is anticipated to provide a broad range of goods and services to the entire Desert Village, including numerous "big-box" stores and other large retail stores. These should be accommodated using creative designs that incorporate a consistent design theme, a strong pedestrian orientation, design techniques to break down the scale and mass of larger buildings, and smaller parking areas. The Town Center serves as the main transit hub for the Desert Village and may also function as a regional center for goods and services. Higher density residential development is appropriate in and near the Town Center.

***Village Center (VC)***—*Insert description of "vision" for Village Centers*

***Neighborhood Center (NC)***—Neighborhood Centers are to be centrally located within the Neighborhood, and each Neighborhood Center is to include a public space, such as a park or plaza. Neighborhood Centers are intended to accommodate a narrower range of uses than Village Centers. For example, neighborhood-scaled commercial/retail and service uses may be appropriate in a Neighborhood Center, while a larger, full-service grocery store would not. Within each Neighborhood is a Neighborhood Center that is intended to be the social nexus of the Neighborhood.

## **1. GOAL: ACCESSIBLE CENTERS**

Ensure that all Centers within the HAMP are integrated with and easily accessible from surrounding Villages and Neighborhoods, as well as from the surrounding community, using a variety of modes of transportation.

### **a) GENERAL POLICIES FOR CENTERS**

#### **(1) Circulation and Access**

- (a) Provide convenient pedestrian, transit, and vehicular access within and between Centers.
- (b) Plan for bus stops, park and rides, and other transit facilities within each Center and provide a means for the incremental implementation of each as transit services become feasible.
- (c) Integrate a fine-grained network of streets and blocks to facilitate ease of movement.
- (d) Provide bicycle parking areas in the core of each Center.

#### **(2) Character and Design**

- (a) Each Center should have a unique character, distinguished by entry features, public art, attractive facades and architectural elements, landscaping, signage and lighting.
- (b) Centers should be designed to provide a visually interesting pedestrian environment, by:
  - (i) Incorporating shade trees, lighting, awnings and overhangs, seating areas, public art displays, and other amenities along sidewalks and pathways;
  - (ii) locate retail stores, restaurants and other active uses on ground floors in high-intensity areas where a vertical mix of uses is feasible;
  - (iii) Locating buildings close to sidewalks and to each other, designed at a human scale;
  - (iv) providing minimum 15-foot wide sidewalks to accommodate a range of activities, such as outdoor restaurant/café seating, sidewalk sales, and transit facilities;
  - (v) defining pedestrian areas using contrasting materials, landscaping, and architectural elements;
  - (vi) avoiding large, unbroken wall surfaces.

#### **(3) Relationship to Surrounding Development**

- (a) Transitions should be provided between Centers and surrounding residential uses by incorporating similar architectural elements and transitioning building scale, height, and mass in their periphery.
- (b) Design side and rear building facades with attention to architectural character and detail comparable to the front facade, particularly if rear and side facades are visible from streets or adjacent properties.
- (c) Address security and privacy considerations in the design of residential uses within the Town and Village Centers.

- (d) Direct all outdoor lighting down, and shield it away from adjacent residential parcels and public roadways.
- (e) Locate and direct loading spaces and refuse collection facilities away from residential uses and pedestrian areas.

**(4) Parking**

- (a) The use of shared parking should be encouraged within all DV Centers.

**2. GOAL: TOWN CENTER AS RETAIL AND EMPLOYMENT HUB**

The Town Center is anticipated to be an employment center, to serve regional retail markets, and to include high-density residential development.

**a) TOWN CENTER POLICIES**

**(1) Development Phasing**

- (a) Master Plan the Town Center and phase development so that all elements and uses are functionally and physically integrated.

**(2) Mix of Uses**

- (a) Attempt to establish three or more significant, revenue-producing and mutually supportive uses, possibly in mixed-use buildings, within the Town Center.
- (b) The types of uses located in the Town Center may include, but are not limited to: multiple-story corporate and professional offices; hotel and travelers' accommodations; convention facilities; high density residential uses; a full array of retail shopping, including big boxes; services, including entertainment, movie theaters, restaurants, and clubs; and civic, cultural, and recreational uses.
- (c) Orient the Town Center around a central organizing element such as a regional mall, galleria, a retail main street, or a pedestrian district. Connect these elements with uninterrupted pedestrian-friendly pathways. Position key components around appropriately scaled public spaces.
- (d) Devote the equivalent of a minimum of 20% of the area to high density residential uses.
- (e) Mix uses within individual buildings.

**(3) Circulation and Access**

- (a) Provide accessibility to the Town Center via the HAMP trail and roadway network.
- (b) Integrate the main transit center for the HAMP area into the Town Center.

**3. GOAL: VILLAGE CENTER AS FOCAL POINTS**

Locate the individual Village Centers so that they serve as commercial, recreational, and social focal points for the residents of the respective Villages. Uses in the Village Center should meet the day-to-day needs of residents.

**a) VILLAGE CENTER POLICIES**

**(1) Mix of Uses**

- (a) Incorporate retail, service, office, and high density residential uses into the centers. Uses may include grocery stores, drugstores, laundromats, beauty salons, day-care centers, preschools, medical offices, health clubs, auto-services, postal services, as well as more specialized goods and services such as hardware stores, professional offices, financial institutions, etc.
- (b) Integrate the uses within Village Centers, both functionally and physically, such that each Village Center acts as a single, mixed-use node for the surrounding residents.
- (c) Anticipate the southeastern-most Village Center to be larger than the others, in order to accommodate potential demand from the populations to the east of and south of the HAMP area.

**(2) Locational Criteria**

- (a) Orient Village Centers around central organizing elements such as plazas, public squares, or main streets.
- (b) Site a community park within close proximity to the Village Center.
- (c) Transit stops should be integrated into the design of the Neighborhood Center.
- (d) Locate or reserve land for a middle school or K-8 school site adjacent to the Community Park, depending on the demand for schools within the Village.

**4. GOAL: NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS TO SERVE LOCAL NEEDS**

*Add goal statement that describes location and role of neighborhood centers.*

**a) NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER POLICIES**

**(1) Locational Criteria**

- (a) Incorporate in each neighborhood, a centrally located Neighborhood Center that includes a public space, such as a park, plaza, or square.